

REMARKS

The Action mailed on November 2, 2004 rejects claim 1 under 35 USC § 112 and claims 1–31 under 35 USC § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,717,573 to Shahoian et. al (“Shahoian”). Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16–18, 22 and 23, cancels claims 4, 19–21, and 24–31, and adds claim 32. Applicant appreciates the time Examiner Lesperance gave the undersigned on August 17, 2005 during a telephonic interview in which the language of claim 1 was discussed and for his review of amended claim 1 on August 25, 2005. Support for the amendment to claim 1 and for new claim 32 can be found at least on pages 19 and 20 of the specification, as well as in Figures 12A-12G. Amendments to claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16–18, 22, and 23 are made to bring claims into accordance with the amendments made to claim 1. No new matter is added.

Claim 1 Patentably Distinguishes Over Shahoian

Amended claim 1 recites an interface process for identifying a user interface command by comparing the shape of an input stroke on a display screen detected by a screen monitor to the shapes associated with a plurality of command strokes. In addition, amended claim 1 recites that the interface process identifies the user interface command independent of a relationship between the location of the input stroke on the display and the location of other visible elements on the display. Shahoian fails to describe such an interface process.

In rejecting claim 1 prior to the current amendments, the Action identifies three commands related to the use of a haptic mouse described in Shahoian as purportedly describing the interface process as previously recited in claim 1. The commands include i) a command to reorder displayed windows, ii) a command to vibrate a mouse, and iii) a command to move a controlled object. Office Action, pages 3–4.

Shahoian describes detecting a command to reorder windows on a display by detecting the depression of a mouse button while a cursor is over a blank area of a displayed window. Column 21, lines 26–43 and column 22, lines 9–24. This identification is not based on a shape of an input stroke traced by a user on a display, as recited in amended claim 1. The identification does not take into account the path the curser traversed in reaching the location. Instead, it is based on the relative location of a curser with respect to a window and other visible elements displayed within the window.

Shahoian describes vibrating a mouse in response to a user dragging an icon or object across a display with a cursor. Column 20, lines 36—45. A user must move a cursor to the location of the icon or object on the display to select and drag the icon or object. Thus, identification of the vibration command depends upon the relative location of the cursor with respect to the location of other visible elements on the display, i.e., the icon or object. However, such dependence on a relationship between the location of an input stroke traced by a user and the location of other visible elements on the display screen is specifically excluded in amended claim 1. Thus, Shahoian's process for detecting and initiating the mouse vibration command also fails to teach or suggest the subject matter recited in amended claim 1.

The third command the Action relies upon in rejecting the previous version of claim 1 includes instructions to move a controlled object, such as a cursor, across a display. Column 11, lines 4—18. Shahoian describes identifying such instructions in response to detecting the rotation of, or the application of inertial forces to a mouse that “rests on a ground surface 22 such as a table top or mouse pad. A user grasps the mouse 12 and moves the mouse in a planar workspace on the surface 22.” Column 4, lines 55-57. That is, the process in Shahoian that identifies this instruction bases its identification on movement of a mouse across surface 22, not based on input strokes traced by a user on a display screen, as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, Shahoian fails to teach or suggest an interface process as recited in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §102 rejection of claim 1. Claims 2, 3, 5–18, 22, and 23 depend from amended claim 1 and add further limitations, thereto. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §102 rejections of these claims, too. New claim 32 also depends from amended claim 1 and adds further limitations thereto. Applicant therefore requests allowance of new claim 32.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. PGLD-P01-003 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward A. Gordon

Registration No.: 54,130

ROPES & GRAY LLP

One International Place

Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624

(617) 951-7000

(617) 951-7050 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant